

### **REMARKS**

As a preliminary matter, the undersigned representative would like to thank Examiner Leader for holding a teleconference on 24 July 2006. During this teleconference, the outstanding Section 112 rejection of claims 8-16 was discussed, and agreement was reached that the foregoing amendments to claims 15 and 16 overcome this Section 112 rejection. The applicants respectfully request that this paper constitute the applicants' Interview Summary.

Claims 8-16 were pending on the mailing date of the present Office Action. Claim 8 has been cancelled in this paper. Claims 15 and 16 have been rewritten in independent form and to overcome the Section 112 rejection, and claims 9-14 have been amended to depend from claim 15. Additionally, claims 17-22 are new claims with subject matter corresponding to claims 9-14, and thus claims 17-22 are fully supported by the originally filed specification. Therefore, claims 9-22 should now be pending in the application.

The status of the application in light of the Office Action dated 24 March 2006 is as follows:

(A) Claims 8-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; and

(B) Claims 8-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 3,607,712 issued to Barton ("Barton").

A. **Response to Section 112 Rejection**

Claims 8-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, on the grounds that the phrase "normal to the workpiece" is indefinite. The Examiner points out that the workpiece may have any configuration (e.g., planar, tubular, spherical, etc.), and as such it is not possible to determine the direction of an axis normal to the workpiece. The applicants thank the Examiner for providing the reasoning supporting this rejection.

Independent claims 15 and 16 have been rewritten to include a workpiece holder that is configured to hold a "planar semiconductor workpiece" in "a processing plane," and a drive unit that rotates the planar semiconductor workpiece normal "to the processing plane." During the teleconference, Examiner Leader indicated that the foregoing amendments would resolve the outstanding rejection under Section 112, second paragraph. Therefore, the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

B. Response to Section 102 Rejection

Claims 8-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Barton. Claim 8 has been cancelled from the application, and as such this rejection of claim 8 is now moot. Claims 9-14 have been amended to depend from claim 15, which was not subject to the Section 102 rejection over Barton. As a result, this rejection of claims 9-14 is also moot. Therefore, the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9-14 under Section 102 over Barton.

C. Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, the claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are patentable over the cited art. More specifically, rewritten independent claims 15 and 16 overcome the outstanding rejection under Section 112, and these claims were not subject to the outstanding Section 102 rejection over Barton. The applicants accordingly request reconsideration of the application and respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. If Examiner Leader has any questions or believes that a teleconference would expedite prosecution of the application, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned representative at (206) 359-3258.

Dated: 29 July 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By P. T. Parker

Paul T. Parker

Registration No.: 38,264

PERKINS COIE LLP

P.O. Box 1247

Seattle, Washington 98111-1247

(206) 359-8000

(206) 359-7198 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant